

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by Stations of the American Broadcasting Co.



Can the United States and Europe Help Promote a Stable and Prosperous Europe?

GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr., Moderator

Speakers

CLAUDE BOURDET

JAMES B. CAREY

EVE CURIE

MILTON KATZ

(See also page 13)

COMING

July 26, 1949

How Will Youth Influence the Future of
Germany?

August 2, 1949

Can Austria Survive as an Individual
Democratic Nation?

Edited by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 15, NUMBER 12  \$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF JULY 19:

"How Can the United States and France Help Promote a Stable and Prosperous Europe?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mlle. CURIE</i>	4
<i>M. BOURDET</i>	6
<i>Mr. KATZ</i>	9
<i>Mr. CAREY</i>	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	13
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!.....	17



THE BROADCAST OF JULY 26:

"How Will Youth Influence the Future of Germany?"



THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 2:

"How Can Austria Survive as an Individual Democratic Nation?"



The Broadcast of July 19, 1949, over the American Broadcasting Company Network from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EDT, was a rebroadcast of the program which originated in the Grand Palais, Paris, France, on July 5.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



LY 19, 1949

VOL. 15, No. 12

How Can the United States and France Help Promote a Stable and Prosperous Europe?

This is Edith Sampson, of the National Council of Negro Women, speaking to you from Paris. This is the second stop on our journey around the world, with 26 representatives of American organizations known as the Town Hall World Seminar. We are making this trip entirely by air, mostly on Pan American World Airways.

Paris, as you may have heard, is full of American tourists. A spirit of friendliness prevails in this great historic city. Language is no real barrier, since many people here speak English. The food is excellent, and the shops are most attractive.

Our party has a full schedule of meetings with French leaders. Yesterday, we met with members of the French and American Press and were received by the American Ambassador and Mrs. David Bruce. Later this week, we shall attend a reception given by Foreign Minister Robert Schuman. Despite our busy schedule, we are not forgetting the serious business at hand, such as our Town Meeting tonight.

Now, to preside over our discussion, here is our moderator, the President of Town Hall, New York, and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny.

Moderator Denny:

Bon soir, voisins. Good evening, neighbors. Tonight, we are happy to greet you from the city of Paris, where our Town Hall group is the guest of France Etats-Unis, an association established to promote mutual understanding between the people of France and the people of the United States. Like our Town Hall in New

York, France Etats-Unis is completely nonpartisan, and has a membership of approximately 40,000 people. We come to you tonight in the name of the American people whose contributions have made our trip possible. We are most grateful for the splendid coöperation we've received from this excellent association, under the leadership of M. Cyrille Makinsky.

We are meeting tonight in the classic Grand Palais in Champs Elysées, where the most important events take place each year. Our audience consists largely of French men and women, and it is probable that most of the questions tonight will be asked in French but they will be translated immediately by our able interpreter M. Andre Kaminker.

You will be interested to know that, thanks to the coöperation of International Business Machines, we are able to record this broadcast in both French and English, for rebroadcast later over the American Broadcasting Company's network in the United States and the *Radio Diffusion Francais* in France.

No matter where you live in the United States or France, you know, if you are aware of recent history, the importance of having a stable and prosperous Europe. So, in association with our host we selected tonight's subject, "How Can France and the United States Coöperate To Promote a Stable and Prosperous Europe." We've invited two Americans and two French journalists to lead our discussion this evening.

Few French names are better known in America than that of Eve Curie, author of the biography of her famous mother, Madame Curie, the discoverer of radium. Mlle. Curie has made several lecture tours in the United States, has written frequently for the *New York Herald Tribune*, and, until very recently, was co-editor of the newspaper, *Paris-Presse*. We'll hear first from Mlle. Curie, then we'll have a different view from another French journalist M. Claude Bourdet, editor and publisher of the newspaper *Combat*. Then we shall hear from Ambassador Milton Katz, Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe for ECA, and the other American speaker will be Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO. Following their discussion, we will have questions from this representative French audience.

And now, Mlle. Curie, it's a pleasure to present you to our French and American listeners. Mlle. Eve Curie. (*Applause*)

Mlle. Curie:

Since 1945, we have won major victories on this devastated continent of ours. Europe at last is living better. The hard work of o

people and the magnitude of American aid have achieved a miracle.

Politically, as misery recedes, Western Europe is regaining its balance. Election returns in France and Italy, Germany, and in Belgium consistently show that the prestige of Bolshevism and the Soviet Union is getting weaker.

The first emergency is over, but the European patient is not cured because the world is not cured. We may have to live for years in this uneasy stalemate of a cold peace with two conflicting ideologies dividing the earth. This is the time to reappraise the European situation and to face squarely the tasks and the difficulties ahead.

What is first on the minds of many French people is that the Atlantic Pact is an unfinished agreement, not ratified, not yet enforced, by a plan of collective rearmament and by explicit strategic commitments. When France asks, "If invasion comes, what then?" there is no clear answer from Washington. I'm afraid my French colleague and friend, Claude Bourdet, shall not agree with me on this subject, yet it does seem obvious to me that the imperative duty of our governments, while devising plans for a stable and prosperous Europe, is to make sure first that this Europe shall survive. And we all know that, for the near future at least, it is American strength that guarantees European freedom.

Security on the Continent is not assured, and neither, truly, is the economic revival of Europe. The first phase of the Marshall Plan, that is true, was a brilliant success. Our production is booming, but up to now, rigid currency values have been paralyzing trade, and exports are lagging. And while most shortages have diminished in Europe, one has remained acute—the shortage of dollars. Mr. Milton Katz knows something about that.

Shall our impoverished country succeed in balancing its accounts before the deadline of 1952, when the Marshall Plan is scheduled to end? I am not in a position to tell, but I can read the answers on the faces of Milton Katz and James Carey.

On the general economic doctrines to be promoted, I think that many Americans and many Frenchmen have ideas in common. Unlike Britain, France, in general, favors reduction of controls, the liberalization of European trade, and, finally, of world trade. But freedom does not go one way only. America, too, maintains trade values and builds her own protection. Yet, in the long run, the increased American purchases in Europe may bring our dollar shortage to an end and make possible the resumption of free trade across the Atlantic.

The political organization of Europe is of course one of the

most difficult problems that we have to face. France is in favor of a gradual federation of free European countries in which Germany should take her place. Whatever very timid progress was achieved so far by the European council of ten nations has mainly been obtained under the active prodding of the French. France should play an important part in trying to make the European council gain authority and popular support and in insisting that its structure should become truly democratic.

Our country still largely depends on the solidarity of her American friends for her own reconstruction, but France in turn is the key to the reconstruction of Europe, as well as a strategic base of the Continent's defense. For the United States, a France still recovering from a terrible war may be for a time a costly ally but it is an irreplaceable one.

Finally, who, if not the Americans and the French, shall bring out and forcefully express the highest goals of the now permanent association between the Old and the New World? I shall insist in asking, with Jim Carey's approval, I hope, who, if not the intelligent and progressive working people of our two republics?

The best links do exist between our civilizations, beyond the very different ways of living and sometimes conflicting ideas. In the course of history, serious crises always did find us on the same side, it is because for generations the citizens of our two countries have been brought up more or less on the same principles; it is because, in spite of their many faults and human imperfections, our nations have steadfastly and stubbornly believed in a few very simple words which, as it happens, are pronounced almost identically in American and in French: democracy, liberty, social justice. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mlle. Curie. Now, for a slightly different view from our next speaker, who was one of the leaders of the French Underground Resistance Movement. He was at that time one of the publishers of a small paper known as *Combat*. He was captured and imprisoned by the Germans in 1944, and was liberated by the Americans at Buchenwald in 1945. He was vice president of the first free Consultative Parliament, and he now continues to publish the newspaper, *Combat*.

We are happy to welcome to our Town Hall platform M. Claude Bourdet. M. Bourdet. (*Applause*)

M. Bourdet:

Well, I'm afraid I'm not going to agree with everything m

friend, Miss Eve Curie, said. But after all, the American audience should hear both sides of the matter.

Now, I shall start with this question of nationalization versus free enterprise, which is a bone of contention inside and outside France. It's a more important issue in France than anywhere else. First of all, many believe that we should give nationalization a chance, because free enterprise in France has had its chance for the last hundred years, and it has not made much of it.

French big business has little in common with American big business. It is often shortsighted and small-minded. It shows little interest in scientific management and scientific research. It is always reluctant to put money on a new idea. That's why French industry works more and more under foreign patents. The French railways and the French electricity-producing industry have shown more up-to-dateness in a few years of public ownership than in a century or half a century of private management.

Even more than the losses of the war, it's the lack of an enterprising spirit of private industry and banking which explains our present lack of equipment and our need of American help.

The second point is that many rulers of French business have been among the most selfish in Europe, and until the uprising of the French workers in 1936, those workers were the worst paid. The great aim of many French leaders of industry and finance is not the idea of producing a lot and selling at the lowest possible prices, paying high wages, and thus creating prosperity for everybody; but rather it is to keep production at a moderate level, sell at high prices, pay the lowest possible wages, and thus make a bit of profit for themselves with the least effort.

The third point is that French big business has been engaged for years in using its financial power for political action to keep the working classes down. They have used their power for the financial blackmail of governments they didn't like in the stock exchange.

They've used it to build up a powerful press, more devoted to the interests of the heavy industries and banks than to the service of the public. In common with their business friends of England, they were friendly to the Munich policy, which has cost the world many millions of human lives.

Now this brings us straight to another question. What about American aid, ERP, the Atlantic Pact? This is what I would like to tell Mr. Carey and Mr. Katz. As long as American aid helps us build up on a national scale, for the benefit of the community, the equipment which the leaders of industry and finance have so long neglected, it should be welcomed with the warmest thanks.

It might have very different—to my mind, disagreeable—effects if it helped to any large extent to boost up the power of our ex-business lords.

Now this could happen in two ways. The Marshall Plan, with all its help to governments devoted to social progress, has, indeed, at the same time, by linking us more closely to the American world, given back a lot of confidence to the wealthy classes, which helps them in their fight to recapture their former privileges. This, which I consider evil, does not weigh as compared with the material benefit of the plan.

But the Atlantic Pact, on the other side, which I believe to have little value as a military instrument and which was not necessary as the possession of the atomic bomb by the U. S. A. is quite enough to keep the U. S. S. R. quiet, that has done even more than the Marshall Plan to restore the fighting spirit of the wealthy classes. However, these two issues have only brought the former rulers of French economy, one could say, psychological help.

Now we become aware of the trend of thought in the U. S. A. of the efforts of large American firms, of the attitude of Congress, and of such news items as Mr. Snyder's trip to Europe. If we are not mistaken, Marshall aid and the Atlantic Pact have paved the way for a large expansion of American private capital in Europe.

This does not only mean that there are going to be some threats to our economic independence. It means something worse. It means that swift expansion of American private investments can only be effected hand in hand with French big business. It means that our former economic—and one may say political—rulers are going to derive a huge amount of power from the influx of American capital into their hands.

We know what the aims and methods of those people are, as we understand that many social and economic reforms which the people have obtained after centuries of fight are going to be blotted out. And in the economic field we feel that the conjunction of American and French private capital—the latter even more unable than the former to understand the benefit of a planned economy—is going to destroy all hope of national planning and lead us back to large depressions and mass unemployment.

So that's why I am sorry to say that I cannot look forward with the same benevolent eyes to all kinds of American aid. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, M. Bourdet.

In view of our subject, "How Can the United States and France

"Help Promote a Stable and Prosperous Europe?" we are most fortunate in having as our first American speaker Ambassador Milton Katz, U. S. Special Representative in Europe for the ECA, on leave from Harvard University, where he is Byrne Professor of Administrative Law. Welcome to Town Meeting, Mr. Milton Katz.

Mr. Katz:

It seems to me fitting that we should talk not just about France or not just about America but about what France and America together can do for Europe. It is a plain fact, upon which France and America agree, that peace and prosperity for each of us depend upon the stability and prosperity of Europe as a whole.

To have asked last summer how France could contribute to the stability of Europe might have sounded quite unrealistic. At that time, France seemed to be one of the main problems of Europe. She appeared to be in no position to help Europe and hardly even to help herself.

She suffered from acute shortages, rampant inflation, and fear and loss of hope among her people. She was heavily in need of American aid and so badly in debt to her European neighbors in the Marshall Plan that more than half of the credits which they granted to each other had to be given to France.

But France's accomplishments in one short year have brought new hope to her people. The franc has become virtually stable. The currency black market has almost dried up. Inflated prices are beginning to move downward. Production has increased and trade has expanded. Her people have shown the will to face their problems through democratic processes. This, perhaps, has been France's biggest accomplishment for Europe—putting her own house in order.

Why is this an accomplishment for Europe? The answer is that a healthy France can be a most powerful force for peace and stability in Europe. The skill and energy of her people, her history and tradition, and the balance between her industry and agriculture and between her resources and her population give her the means of leadership.

These means she must use. France must help lead Western Europe toward economic unity. Economic unity is essential to a lasting recovery. It can be achieved in stages.

The first step—and it's a crucial one—is the creation of a Europe-wide market. A European must be able to sell anywhere in Europe and to buy anywhere in Europe. When he is free to sell anywhere in Europe, each country and each individual can

concentrate on the things which he can produce best.

When he is free to sell anywhere in Europe, he will be far better able to organize the efficient production at low prices with high wages which M. Bourdet has told us is so badly needed in France. With European consumers free to buy anywhere in Europe, European producers will be stimulated by competition to sell more and better goods at lower prices.

Mlle. Curie has spoken of the political and strategic importance of unity in Western Europe and in the Atlantic community. I think we should also bear in mind what unity means in the kitchen and in the workshop. As we Americans have learned from experience, free trade throughout a continent means better jobs and more goods for more people at lower prices.

And we Americans—what can we do? In part, it seems to me that the answer is that we should keep up what we have been doing. We can continue to provide many of the things needed for the rebuilding of Europe. In so doing, we are giving to Europeans the opportunity and the time to make the coöperative adjustments which must be made if Europe is to be stable and Europeans are to be free.

In part, it means keeping America itself prosperous and strong and free. Europeans, both our friends and our enemies in Europe, know that a serious weakening within America would mean disaster for Europe. In part, I believe it means that we Americans must continue to think as we have been thinking. That is, we must never forget that what we do at home and what happens to us at home is vital to the rest of the world, and that what happens to the rest of the world is vital to us. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Katz.

Our next speaker has appeared many times on our Town Meetings in the United States and has participated frequently in conferences of trade union leaders here in France and in other parts of Europe. James B. Carey is one of the national officers—secretary-treasurer, to be exact—of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, one of the largest labor organizations in the United States. Mr. Carey, will you give us the benefit of your advice on this question? Mr. Carey. (*Applause*)

Mr. Carey:

Mr. Denny and friends. You have heard the rather optimistic views of Mlle. Curie and Mr. Katz and also the views of M. Bourdet, who seems to take a rather dim view of things.

But I'm sure they'll all agree with me that there are three conditions for a stable and prosperous Europe. One is primarily an American responsibility, another is primarily a European responsibility, and the third is the common responsibility of Americans and Europeans.

First, we cannot expect to create a stable and prosperous Europe if the United States walks blindly into another depression, or fritters away its strength in the kind of desperate reaction which prevails in the present American Congress.

A Europe on the march toward a better life needs an America on the march, as well. An America which cannot reach its own goals of economic and social justice cannot long provide either material or moral sustenance to the rest of the world.

Secondly—and here is where the European responsibility comes in—many French and other European workers have swallowed a lie about the nature of American democracy—a lie which must be finally and completely repudiated. They think that America is exclusively the land of cowboys and Indians, of cops and gangsters, of Hollywood stars and Wall Street bankers—especially Wall Street bankers.

And because they have fallen a victim of this distorted picture of American life, they do not understand that America, above all else, is a land of people who work in the mines, in the mills, in the offices, and on the farms.

This is the America that counts. These Americans have found the expression of their hopes for a fuller life in the American labor movement, which has grown over the past fifteen years into a mighty force for economic democracy, which can and does challenge any effort of American reactionaries to keep the world imprisoned in the discredited patterns of the past. And it is in this solidarity with these people and that labor movement that the free men of Europe can truly build a society of peace and abundance without surrendering their freedom.

And now I come to the third condition. We of America and you of France must together seize this opportunity presented by the Marshall Plan to lay the economic foundations for that better life. This means that the Europeans must use the Marshall Plan to bind Europe into an economic unity. It means, also, that we must think of the problems of recovery less in terms of production for its own sake, of stabilizing this currency or that currency, or of balancing this budget or that budget, and instead think of recovery more in terms of giving the worker in Paris, in Rome, or in Berlin a bigger stake in the recovery effort.

I say to the officials and statesmen and economists, not only of Europe but in the United States, recovery is more than a matter of stabilizing currency, of balanced budgets, or balanced trade payments. It is a matter of healthy people, of more purchasing power, better housing, more security, more dignity. I'm all for balancing budgets, mind you, but I don't believe in balancing them on the back of the guy who works on the assembly line at Renault or the shipyards at Nancy.

The American labor movement supports the Marshall Plan because it represents not only a great instance of international solidarity but a practical tool for building a prosperous and progressive Europe. We don't want to perpetuate the old structures of wealth and luxury in the midst of poverty and squalor and insecurity. We believe in the unity of Europe, but not the kind of unity represented by the Churchills and the Renaults. For a political unity which is not based on an intelligent and farsighted economic program and on a higher standard of living is merely a sham and an illusion.

France and the United States can assure a stable and prosperous Europe by remaining true to the best of their traditions, by remembering that democracy is a militant creed—a creed that asserts the essential dignity and worth of the human being.

This is the creed of the French and of the American Revolution. This is the creed of Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. If we hold fast to their vision, we can build the kind of world in which all men will be neither beggars nor slaves. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Carey.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you've been very polite with each other just now, so let's step up here around the microphone and have a few questions back and forth before we take the questions from the audience.

And since we haven't heard from Miss Curie for a time, Mademoiselle Curie, would you start the question period?

Mlle. Curie: I would like to ask a question of Ambassador Katz. I would like to point out that America has now reached a saturated buyers' market, and it's very difficult in the world competition for European countries to sell their goods in the dollar area. If the dollar shortage remains acute in Europe, because of that difficulty for European countries to sell, to whom does America expect to sell her growing surpluses, particularly after the Marshall Plan shipments end?

Mr. Katz: Mlle. Curie, you've just asked me a large, round,

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

CLAUDE BOURDET—Formerly one of the leaders of the French Resistance group "Combat," Claude Bourdet is now editor and publisher of the newspaper of the same name.

JAMES B. CAREY—Mr. Carey is secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, a post which he has held since 1942. A native of Philadelphia, where he was born in 1911, he attended Wharton Evening School and the University of Pennsylvania. For several years he was an electrical worker in a radio laboratory in Philadelphia. In 1934, he was appointed general organizer for the U. S. of the A. F. of L., and in 1938 was appointed secretary of the C. I. O. During World War II, Mr. Carey was a member of the production planning board of the Office of Production Management. He has been a C. I. O. delegate to international conventions in Paris, London, and Moscow, and is a contributor to labor journals.

EVE CURIE—The daughter of the famed Marie Curie, Mlle. Eve Curie is copublisher of the *Paris-Presse*. Born in Paris, France (1904), she graduated from Sévigné Collège with degrees of Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Philosophy, and subsequently devoted several years to the

study of the piano and musical criticism. After the death of her mother in 1934, she collected and classified all the papers, manuscripts, and personal documents left by her mother. At the beginning of World War II, she acted as coördinator of the war activities at the Ministry of Information in Paris.

Mlle. Curie has visited the United States on lecture tours several times since 1939. She has published two books, *Madame Curie* and *Journey Among Warriors*.

MILTON KATZ—Mr. Katz is the U. S. Deputy Representative for the ECA in France. Born in New York City in 1907, he graduated from Harvard in 1931 with a degree of Bachelor of Laws, and was admitted to the New York Bar the same year. He has held several posts with the U. S. Government, having been legal secretary to the U. S. Circuit Judge, attorney for the RFC, and special assistant to the attorney general of the United States. While on leave from Harvard University as professor of law, he served during the war with the War Production Board and the Office of Strategic Services, and later as a lieutenant commander in the U. S. Navy Reserve (1944-46).

Mr. Katz is the author of the book, titled *Cases and Materials in Administrative Laws*, and is a contributor to legal periodicals.

truth-filling question. If I knew the answer to that, I think I could have one of the highest gifts of statesmanship available to human beings in the world today.

All that I can say in answer to your question is this: I do think, I think your question implies, that if the American people want to get a world trade in which they can sell, the American people must be prepared to buy the goods which other nations are able to produce and wish to sell to America.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Katz. Mr. Carey has a question.

Mr. Carey: I think that perhaps I can help with that answer. People can learn to live better, live in better houses, yes, and have better schools and hospitals, if we can use the products that we produce in such abundance and if they are sold to us at prices that we can buy them back reasonably.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. M. Bourdet.

M. Bourdet: My question would be put, also, to Mr. Katz. Do people in America understand, as some people seem to in France, that there may come a time—and maybe that time has come already—where balanced economies of countries are just as impossible as Mr. Carey just remarked that balanced budgets might

be? That is, that in one single country there is no question whether part of a country balances its exports to another part. It may be quite possible, but it is impossible *now* to balance exports and imports from America, to America, and so on. We have thought in France that one of the reasons why the Marshall Plan had been organized is because America had understood that.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Katz, please.

Mr. Katz: To the first part of his question—do the American people understand that there are times when it's very difficult for the European peoples and other peoples to balance their trade with the Western Hemisphere—I take it that the answer is clearly yes. And some 10 billions of Marshall aid, voted by the American people, make it perfectly clear that they understand it and are willing to act upon it.

Do they understand that all of their efforts may not produce the peace on earth and the millennium in four years? I hope they do. I think that, on the record, the American people—and I speak of the American people, not merely their government—have shown an amazing record of sympathetic comprehension. There is lend-lease, there is the British loan, there is UNRRA, there is the Marshall aid.

My own conviction, and it's perhaps a simple-minded one, is that if we all take pains to lay the facts before the American people, they're likely to come as close to the right answer as anybody else in this world of sin and sorrow. (*Applause*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Katz. Now Mr. Carey has a question. You seem to have given satisfaction to some members of the audience, Mr. Katz.

Mr. Carey: Mr. Bourdet, in listening to your opening remarks I understood you to indicate that the industrialists of France lacked the vision of American big businessmen. I wonder, sometimes, if you believe whether these great industrialists of the United States have any great degree of vision. They didn't think up—they did not support the Tennessee Valley Administration. They are not in favor of social security legislation. They, too, like to get workers to work at a whole lot lower rate of pay and sell their goods at the highest possible price the market will stand.

I think, perhaps, the employers in France are cut from the same cloth as the employers in the United States, but the community forces and particularly the labor groups require these employers to become efficient by seeking improvements in their standard of life which require the employers, if they want to remain in business, to meet the needs of the community. (*Applause*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Any comments? The microphone

ready for either of you, M. Bourdet or Mr. Katz. Yes, M. Bourdet?

M. Bourdet: I just wanted to add that I don't know whether American businessmen are much better than the French, but I'm certain that there's quite a difference, because the state of efficiency of American industry has not only been pushed forward by the American masses but also by the extraordinary efficiency of certain leaders of industry, and therefore there has been more wealth to divide. And that, I think, is what did not happen in France, and that is the main reason why we've been forced to endorse programs like nationalization.

Mlle. Curie: I'd like to put a question to Mr. Carey. I think we all agree that contacts between the working people of America and France and many other countries are extremely important, and that means contacts between trade union people. I want to ask Mr. Carey what hopes he puts in the forthcoming meeting of Free Trade Unions which is scheduled for next November, with a preparatory conference, I believe, in July, in London, the aim of this conference being the setup of a new world federation of trade unions devoid of Communist influence.

Mr. Carey: Mlle. Curie, despite the conflicts within the American labor movement, they are in unity today in assisting in establishing with the French workers represented by the Christian Trade Unions in force over here and the other workers of other countries a single, powerful, all-inclusive World Labor Organization excluding only the Communist groups. That organization will come into being, I am certain, with the unified purpose of helping the people of this world who are now not organized with considerable success and enthusiasm. Yes, we can look forward to the establishment of that organization in November.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Katz?

Mr. Katz: I should like to put a question to M. Bourdet. M. Bourdet, you have obviously rather clearly defined views about French business, and I don't want to comment on those, but I should like to ask you this: Don't you think it would be too bad if you or other Frenchmen allowed your distrust of your fellow countrymen to cause you to distrust anyone else who seeks to help your country?

M. Bourdet: I think I would like Mr. Katz to put that more clearly.

Mr. Katz: Well, as I understand your line of argument, it runs as follows: "I don't like French big business—it seems to me that if we put any Marshall aid into France, it might help the businessman here and there. Therefore I'm against Marshall aid and the Atlantic Pact."

M. Bourdet: Well, it seems to me that I haven't been clear enough, because I said that the slight inconvenience of Marshall aid, regarding this direction of thought, was so small compared to the material benefits which we get that certainly there's nothing to be said against Marshall aid. But what I said was against private investments in Europe which, to a large extent, are going to help those people. That's the difference.

Mr. Denny: All right. Anything further, Mr. Katz? If not, I see a great many people out here in this audience with both French and English questions. I hope they'll have them ready. But in the meantime, we have a special message of interest to our listeners.

Mr. Barnhardt:

This is John J. Barnhardt, representing the American Legion on tour with Town Hall's Round-the-World Seminar. It was my happy privilege recently to march with my comrades up the world-famous boulevard Champs Elysées to the Arch of Triumph to take part in the July Fourth ceremony at the tomb of France's Unknown Soldier.

I am happy to greet you from Paris, the birthplace of the American Legion, and I hope that Legionnaires in the United States and France will follow these Town Hall meetings each week as we endeavor to bring into your homes through the radio the views and questions of the people in twelve world capitals.

In just a moment, we are going to have questions from a representative French audience here in the Grand Palais. Most of the questions will be in the French language, but they will be translated immediately into English. There will be questions from French working men and women, businessmen and farmers, questions of special interest to them individually and related to our Seminar subject, demonstrating the Town Hall method of freedom of speech in action. They bring to you the thoughts and feelings of our friends and neighbors across the Atlantic. This would not have been possible in 1919, when the American Legion was founded, thirty years ago.

Now, for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now, we are ready with our question period here at the Grand Palais in Paris. Our questions from the audience may come to us in French or in English, but they will be translated immediately for the benefit of our listeners. Now, a question from the lady over here in the slightly lavender dress. Twenty-five words.

Lady: I would like to ask Mr. Katz whether he believes that stabilization could be brought about by which the value of the money will always be in conformity with the prices of the goods?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Katz. They've asked you some pretty hot questions here tonight.

Mr. Katz: Yes. I seem to get the easy ones. I'd like to modify the question slightly before I answer it. I do believe that it's well within the powers of France, if she organizes herself, to stabilize her currency on a basis which would make possible both effective production and fair distribution of her production among the various elements in her population.

Man: This is for Mlle. Curie and Mr. Katz. If we cannot have a stable and prosperous Europe without a stable and prosperous Asia, Near East, Africa, and South America, what should France and America do to stimulate world rather than just a local European recovery?

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mlle. Curie says she thinks that's another subject she'd like to have Mr. Katz answer first. Mr. Katz?

Mr. Katz: Thank you very much, Mlle. Curie. (*Laughter*) Well, I'm all in favor of stabilizing Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and, indeed, any other part of this planet or any other. I'd just like to suggest that it's a good idea to start some place, and, on the whole, I think Europe's a very good place to start.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, Mlle. Curie.

Mlle. Curie: Well, I think I would agree with Mr. Katz and probably with the American taxpayers, also. I agree with him, because it's a very difficult thing to start such big projects all over the world. However, I quite agree with the questioner that the situation in Asia is extremely perilous and difficult and that there will be no stability in the world—no real stability—before we have the world, of which we dreamed for so long.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, the next question from the young man over there.

Man: Does Mr. Carey think that the Atlantic Pact conforms to the U. S. Constitution? Is he for it?

Mr. Carey: Yes, I am for the Atlantic Pact. I'm for the Atlantic

Pact, because it's the same kind of procedure we engage in at home in the trade unions. When we're faced with difficult situations, rather than each and every union establishing a large defense fund, we pool our resources. It tends to make us stronger with a minimum of expenditure.

I completely disagree with M. Bourdet when he states that the Atlantic Pact tends to make the nations more nationalistic. It does just the opposite. It tends to solidify the nations in a common purpose and can result in less expenditures for security and military reasons.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. M. Bourdet has a comment to make.

M. Bourdet: I just wanted to tell Mr. Carey that I never said that the Atlantic Pact made nations more nationalistic. I said it made the ruling classes more imperialistic and more reactionary as regarding, for instance, their attitude toward the colonial people or toward the workers in France. Well, it's up to Mr. Carey and his friends to help us fight them.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Carey, your comment?

Mr. Carey: As we establish helpful projects like the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact to give confidence to the people, especially in the war devastated areas, I do hope that even the reactionaries gain confidence. But I also hope that other forces in the community will likewise gain confidence, and be a check in terms of influence against the reactionaries.

Likewise, I believe that if France becomes stronger industrially—and the other countries of Europe—they will be less dependent upon a nation like Germany of the past. I believe by building strength and not being too concerned by the attitude—the past attitude—of the reactionaries, we can build a progressive world.
(Applause)

Man: If M. Bourdet is not in favor of the Marshall Plan, would he kindly tell us what he would suggest in order to revitalize the French economy?

Mr. Denny: Thank you. M. Bourdet?

M. Bourdet: I said, for the second or third time, that although I am in favor of the Marshall Plan, which helps the money plan, which is the basis of the reconstruction of our economy, I am not in favor of massive private investments of American capital in our country which, among other things, are going to destroy the money plan and all its system of reconstruction of our economy.
(Applause)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the lady here at the table. Yes?

Lady: M. Bourdet, how much nationalization already exists in

France? And in the future, what industries and services would you put under nationalization and in what order?

Mr. Denny: M. Bourdet?

M. Bourdet: The industries and parts of business which are nationalized in France are banks, the coal industry, the electricity industry, a small part of the automotive industry, and the aircraft-carrying industry.

Well, we believe—at least, I believe—that except the steel industry, now—which it would be exceedingly interesting to see nationalized—no other industry should for any long time be nationalized in France. Maybe none at all.

Man: It is three hundred years since Henry IV, King of France, suggested that we have a federated Europe. Do you believe that this would be a good idea at the present time for the nations of Western Europe?

Mr. Denny: That was Mayor Morrison of New Orleans, Mlle. Curie, in both languages. (*Applause*)

Mlle. Curie: Yes, I am in favor, and I think many French people are in favor of the beginning of a European federation, but of course it is not at all the ideal solution that only the countries of Western Europe should federate. It is by necessity that we should start that way, with the hope that at some future time other countries will have free institutions—countries of Eastern Europe and will also join in that federation. There is no real Europe without Czechoslovakia, without Poland, and so on.

But I think, just like Mr. Carey said, that you must start a job and then go on and enlarge it. I think a good start is to federate Western Europe as it is today, and then try to enlarge it.

Man: My question is for Mr. Carey. He has spoken very pointedly of reactionary big business. I wonder if the people of the world can trust reactionary labor leaders any more. And I'm speaking of Harry Bridges and James Petrillo, who tie up shipping and things like that.

Mr. Denny: The gentleman calls a spade a spade. Mr. Carey, step up.

Mr. Carey: Well, I think reaction indicates a fear of the people. And I would oppose reaction in any form, whether it be communism, industrial tyranny, or fascism. Or by whom that reaction is practiced, especially by Harry Bridges. But I would not suggest that Mr. Petrillo and Harry Bridges have the power to exercise their reactionary influence, as would the head of the United States Steel Corporation, or some large corporation, who determines the destinies of more people.

Man: I would like to ask this question of Mlle. Curie. Mr. Carey

did not answer the question before. While I desire to destroy the influence of dictatorial communism as much as anyone, do you not think your dilemma over failure to ratify the Atlantic Pact by the United States arises out of the fact that such a pact would necessarily commit the United States to war upon an armed conflict against any signatory and without a vote of our Congress contrary to the Constitution of the United States?

Mlle. Curie: It is of course up to the American people and not to the French to see in what form they want to agree to the Pact and what form they want to ratify. The American Congress will say that in the next two weeks, I believe. Certainly, in the minds of Europeans, an association for good or for worse for defense implies this, and it implies the obligation to make sacrifices when the danger comes.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, *Mlle. Curie*. Now, *Mr. Carey* has a comment on that question.

Mr. Carey: I didn't mean to avoid replying directly to the question. I thought I had. Yes, I believe the Atlantic Pact is constitutional. I believe the Supreme Court will find it constitutional. I believe Congress will enact the necessary enabling laws, and they will be found constitutional and will be supported by the American people.

Man: *M. Bourdet*, do you know the intentions of the Marshall Plan?

Mr. Denny: What was that, please?

Man: I asked *M. Bourdet* if he knows the intentions of the Marshall Plan?

M. Bourdet: Well, as a journalist, I think I do. But do you want me to say what I think they are?

Man: It's only a baby. Let it live.

Mr. Denny: All right. Go ahead, *M. Bourdet*.

M. Bourdet: Well, the main idea of the Marshall Plan is to enable Europe to become independent, self-supporting, and to resume its former position of prosperity; by which, again, it might be a useful instrument in establishing peace in the world, first, and in trading with America, second.

Man: Does *Mr. Katz* believe that European labor can achieve prosperity via the route of nationalism, and if so, on the path that they are now following, such as in France?

Mr. Denny: *Mr. Katz*, please.

Mr. Katz: I don't know just what you mean by the path they are now following. As for the question as to whether they can achieve prosperity along national lines, I don't believe that either European labor or any other part of Europe can achieve stability

and prosperity unless it undertakes to do so in terms of Europe as a whole. I think a coöperative effort of the Western European peoples is essential to their security and their freedom.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. M. Bourdet has something to add to Mr. Katz' remark.

M. Bourdet: I can add to what Mr. Katz said. The people behind the labor movement in France and in other countries of Europe are, of all people in Europe, the most internationally minded. The one thing that gets them to conform to this idea of Europe is to show them that this future United Europe is not going to be a tool in the hands of the former ruling class, but it's going to be something for the people.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the question over here.

Man: A question for Mr. Carey. In view of your remarks about reaction and big business, I would like to have you answer me this: Who has control over the destinies of more people, and who has more power—Mr. Irving Olds, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, or Mr. John L. Lewis, chief of the United Mine Workers?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Carey, please.

Mr. Carey: I'm not going to try to assess the relative power of the two individuals named, but we do have in the United States a mixed economy, in which we have industries that operate under the direction of the Government. We have industries that operate accountable to the people. We have a rather mixed setup of checks and balances, and I do hope that the union headed by Mr. Lewis is sufficiently strong and sufficiently powerful to have a check on the operators of the coal industry, and I am certain that the Steel Union does influence to a high degree the decisions of the steel industry. I do hope that their influence will be such in the very near future, that they can bring those employers to grant concessions that will help establish the necessary purchasing power on the part of the people to keep American industry operating and providing full employment.

Man: A question for Mlle. Curie. In the proposed cultural or economic federation of Western European countries, would you eliminate any countries, and if so, which countries and for what reason?

Mlle. Curie: I would put it another way. I would take in all countries with democratic institutions, and as more countries have democratic institutions, I would take them in.

I think that France, as I'm speaking for part of the French, has shown a great spirit by saying that she would take in Germany

in that federation, and I think that means that France is really taking a very broad view of this problem.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mlle. Curie. Now, while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here's a special message of interest to you.

Mrs. Sampson: This is Edith Sampson again, to tell you more about the activities of our Town Hall World Seminar in Paris. Tomorrow morning, we begin our round-table discussions with distinguished French leaders and representatives of the French people. Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador to European Recovery Administration, and Gaston Tessier, President of the Christian Labor Unions, will speak to us about French recovery. At the next Seminar, we will hear from M. Gascuel, French economist, and Genevieve Tabouis, famous French journalist, on France's position in world affairs. The next day we will have a discussion on "Private Enterprise versus Nationalization," in which all members of the Seminar and other French speakers will participate.

On Friday, we are to leave for Berlin, to discuss some very important questions, about which Mr. Denny will tell us in just a moment.

Now, for the summaries of tonight's discussion, we return you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: We hear first from Mr. Carey.

Mr. Carey: Recognizing that governments alone, regardless of how well intentioned they may be, cannot assure a prosperous and peaceful world, we must involve in participation of these important decisions all the people. And the nongovernmental groups, like labor groups, coöperative groups, should join together in assuring that the people of the world can taste of the four freedoms.

Mr. Denny: And now we hear from Mr. Katz.

Mr. Katz: In many ways, the job of France and the job of America in contributing to the stability and prosperity of Europe are the same. It is the job of each to make itself and keep itself healthful, vigorous, and free. And it is the job of each to help give leadership to the development of a unified Europe and a unified Atlantic community.

Mr. Denny: M. Bourdet.

M. Bourdet: I would like to make an appeal to Americans who are not only interested in promoting Franco-American friendship but also in the development of social progress all over the world which is a higher goal still, in the condition of peace.

We French democrats are fighting a two-way battle not only for political freedom but also for social justice, and here we need

the help not of American businessmen but of the American working class and all progressive elements. Their battle will be our battle. Their fate will be our fate, and ours will be theirs.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, M. Bourdet. Mlle. Curie, may we hear from you, please.

Mlle. Curie: To me, a continuous Marshall aid program and an Atlantic Pact enforced by concrete agreements for defense are absolutely inseparable. I think that together they should create a zone of security and opportunity within which Western Europe can and shall regain, perhaps much faster than we believe, its prosperity and its strength.

The 280 million citizens of the free countries of Europe and the 140 million citizens of the United States should become permanent attaches to save a civilization which is their common and priceless property. America, France, and Britain should be the democratic leaders of this association destined to preserve the liberty of the world. (Applause)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mlle. Curie, Claude Bourdet, Milton Katz, and James V. Carey for your counsel on this question. As usual, copies of this broadcast in English can be obtained by writing for the Town Meeting Bulletin to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, enclosing 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

Now, next week from Berlin, we will consider the very important question: "How Will Youth Influence the Future of Germany?" Our speakers will be Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, Director of Education of the Cultural Relations Division of OMGUS; Mr. Melvin Lasky, American Editor of the paper *Der Monat*; Mr. Waldemar von Knoeringen, member of the Bavarian Parliament; and Peter D. Propp, student of economics at Freier University in Berlin.

We invite you to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 14

28. What Should We Do About Race Segregation?
29. What Should the Administration Do About the High Cost of Living?
30. Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?
31. Are Our Ideals Being Destroyed by the Machine Age?
35. Is Labor Entitled to Another Wage Increase?
36. Are Corporate Profits Too High?
37. What's Behind the Crisis in Indonesia?
38. Can Modern Capitalism Meet the Needs of Modern Man?
39. Are We Educating for the Needs of Modern Man?
40. How Can We Make a Defense Pact With Western Europe?
41. Do We Need a New Approach to Peace?
42. Is There Any Defense Against Atomic Warfare?
43. Should We Adopt a Compulsory National Health Insurance Program?
44. Should Communists Be Allowed To Teach in Our Colleges?
45. Will a Union of the Democracies Now Promote Peace?
47. How Can We Legislate for General Welfare Without Curbing Personal Liberty?
48. What Does Democracy Really Mean?
49. Is Modern Woman Failing Her Responsibilities?
50. Is the State of the Union Still Good?
51. Should the Senate Ratify the North Atlantic Pact?
52. How Can We Find Personal Peace and Security in Today's World?

VOLUME 15

1. Should We Help To Rearm Western Europe?
2. Should Minority Groups Exercise Censorship Over Books and Films?
3. What Should We Do About the Communist Threat in Asia?
4. How Much Must We Spend for Real National Security?
5. How Can We Best Resolve Our Differences With Russia?
6. What Should Be the Limits on Your Free Speech?
7. How Can the Free Peoples of the World Best Share Peace and Well-Being?
8. Is the Rent Law Fair to Tenants and Landlords?
9. Are We Spoiling Our Children?
10. What Is the Best Answer to Alcoholism?
11. Does the Socialist State Tend To Destroy Individual Initiative?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, Box 56, New York 46, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: _____

26 Weeks for Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c